

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/501,007	07/08/2004	Jacheon Lee	Q82391	1859
23373 75	11/06/2006		EXAM	INER
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800			COVINGTON, RAYMOND K	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20037			1625	
		•	DATE MAILED: 11/06/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary		10/501,007	LEE ET AL.
		Examiner	Art Unit
		Raymond Covington	1625
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SH WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stareply received by the Office later than three months after the material part of the provided patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	B DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply find will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH that the cause the application to become ABAN	TION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)
Status			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) T Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	his action is non-final. wance except for formal matters	•
Disnositi	ion of Claims		•
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□ 8)□	Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and ion Papers The application is abjected to by the Event	drawn from consideration. d/or election requirement.	
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examination The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corrupt The oath or declaration is objected to by the	accepted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance rection is required if the drawing(s)	. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119		
a)[Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forei All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. ents have been received in App riority documents have been receau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	lication No ceived in this National Stage
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔯 Inform	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0r No(s)/Mail Date 7/8/04.	Paper No(s)/M	mary (PTO-413) lail Date mal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/501,007

Art Unit: 1625

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoffman et al US 4,444,784 taken with Taoka et al US 6,331,641(US equivalent of WO 00/34264) in view of Dabora et al US 5,159,104

Hoffman et al teach preparing simvastin from lovastatin by hydrolysis of the lactone ring using lithium hydroxide followed by relactonization, protecting the hydroxyl group on the lactone ring, then acylation with 2,2-dialkylbutyryl acid and deprotecting the lactone hydroxyl group. See, for example, columns 5-6, column 14 line 3, which teach using tertabutylammonium fluoride and example 3. Taoka et al teach an analogous process which uses lithium hydroxide or potassium hydroxide in a 1 to 10 ratio based on lovastatin with 2,2dimethylbutyryl chloride as the acylating agent. See, for example, column 2 lines 1-65, column 3 lines 25-30, column 4 lines 40-46, and column 5 lines 33-36. Dabora et al also teaches

Application/Control Number: 10/501,007

Art Unit: 1625

analogous process for acylating using 2,2dimethylbutyryl acid or the 2,2dimethylbutyryl chloride derived therefrom. See, column 2 lines 5-15 and column 4 step c.

Hoffman et al differs from the claimed invention it uses lithium hydroxide instead of potassium hydroxide, it uses a dialkylbutyryl acid instead of a dialkylbutyryl bromide or chloride and, with respect to claim 5, it uses a tertabutylammonium fluoride instead of tertabutylammonium bromide.

However, the use of lithium hydroxide or potassium hydroxide in analogous processes is known as taught by Taoka et al. The use of dialkylbutyryl acid or dialkylbutyryl chloride is also known as taught by Taoka et al.

Further, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use tertabutylammonium fluoride in lieu of tertabutylammonium bromide in light of their close structural similarities and their known use as acylating catalyst.

With respect to claim 8 it is well known in the art the acylation of lactones by conventional procedures involving temperatures of e.g. 100°C typically employ benezene as an inert organic solvent. Further, the use of Dean-Stark traps in processes involving benzene, particularly azeotropic separations, is also well known in the art. Note Wikipedia Dean-Stark apparatus. To apply these

techniques to other analogous latone acylation processes such as that recited in the claims would have been obvious as the results would not have been unexpected.

In view of the art as a whole the claimed invention would have been obvious as the results would not have been unexpected.

No claim is allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond Covington whose telephone number is (571) 272-0681. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas McKenzie at telephone number (571) 272-0681.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thomas McKenzie
SPE
Art Unit 1625

RKC